

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14-27 are rejected. Claims 4, 8 and 13 are cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19 and 26-27 are amended. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14-27 remain.

Applicants request reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

I. 35 U.S.C. §103

A. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-20, 22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,388,997 issued to Scott ("Scott") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,541 issued to Schneider ("Schneider"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 4. Applicant has amended claim 6 to include the limitations of claim 8. Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitations of claim 13. And, Applicant has amended claims 15, 19, 26 and 27 to include the limitations of claim 4 (time delay equation 1). As asserted in the Office Action, none of the prior art teaches the limitations included in claims 4, 8 and 13.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection for claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-20, 22 and 24-27 is respectfully requested.

B. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott, in view of Schneider and further in view of U. S. Patent 6,212,405 issued to Jiang et al. ("Jiang").

Applicant's claim 21 depends on amended claim 19. As asserted in the Office Action, none of the prior art teaches the limitations of claim 4. As asserted above in section I(A), Applicant has amended claim 19 to include the limitations from claim 4.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection for claim 21 is respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion that claims 4, 8 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, and 10 to place claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14 in allowable condition. Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 19 and 26-27 to include the limitations including time delay equation 1. As asserted in the Office Action, none of the prior art teaches time delay equation 1.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14-27, as it now stands are allowable for the reasons given above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely 1-3, 5-7, 9-12 and 14-27, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAEMAN LLP

Dated: April 30, 2004

By


Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on April 30, 2004.


Jean Svoboda